



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# SYNTAX IN CAESAR

---

W. L. CARR

Shortridge High School, Indianapolis, Ind.

---

## II. THE USES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE

In a former article<sup>1</sup> the writer undertook to discuss from the standpoint of a teacher the problem of case construction in Caesar. It was shown how comparatively small is the number of really different case uses, and suggestions were given for making clear to the pupil the fundamental distinctions and the relations existing between these uses. There was presented, in illustration, a chart of case uses for a single book of Caesar.

If such a method of presenting case constructions has been found helpful, it may be said that some such plan for dealing with the uses of the subjunctive in Caesar has been found all but absolutely necessary. The unsystematic treatment of the subjunctive in the great majority of first books and grammars makes it next to impossible for the pupil to get anything like a comprehensive view of the subject. The table shown (with this paper) is a compilation from five classroom charts, each covering one book, except that Book I is divided at the end of chap. xxix, the remaining chaps. xxx to liv being read after the completion of Book IV and is here treated as a separate unit.

One important fact is at once apparent. The subjunctive is not found in independent sentences in Caesar I-IV, but is used only in various subordinate clauses. This limitation is of course due to the narrative, indirect-quotation form of the writing. The problem of mood usage is thus greatly simplified and attention is concentrated where attention is most needed. The uses of the subjunctive in wishes, exhortations, or conditions, as such, have no place in Caesar, and the corollary of that proposition would certainly exclude elaborate treatment of these uses from prose composition books based on Caesar.

<sup>1</sup> Published in the *School Review*, March, 1909.

# Uses of the Subjunctive in Caesar I—IV.

ENGLISH EQUIVALENT	CLASSIFICATION OF CLAUSES	INTRODUCTORY WORD	Bk. I	Bk. II	Bk. III	Bk. IV	Bk. I	TOTALS
			1-29				30-34	
OR INFINITIVE	<b>Volitive</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>240</b>
	Substantive Volitive Clauses, including Indirect Commands Prohibitions, Clauses of Request, Consent, Concession.	{ ut ne Interrog. qui etc. qui etc.	3 18 7	3 14 3	9 10 2	11 13 5	5 20 11 3	31 35 27 5 1 22
English Subjunctive or Verb-phrase with <i>shall, should</i> is to, was to, etc.	Volitive (Deliberative) Indirect Questions.	ut	1	5	2	6	5	7
	Relative Volitive Clause	ut	11	6	1	7	11	36
<i>may, might</i> will, would <i>may, might</i>	Relative Clauses of Purpose	quo	2	3	2	2	2	7
	"Pure" Clauses of Purpose	ne	2	4	4	2	2	14
From . . . . . ing (Verbal Noun)	Clauses of Fear (Act not wanted.)	ne	2	2			2	6
	Clauses of Fear (Act wanted.)	ut					1	1
	Negative Clauses of Volitive Origin (acts not wanted) after verbs of Hindrance etc.	ne	2				1	3
		quominus				1	1	2
		quin		2	4	1	3	10
<i>shall, should</i>	<b>Anticipatory</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>86</b>
	Clauses of Anticipation	{ dum quoad priusquam quid	2 1		3 1 3			5 1 9
<i>should</i> Less exactly, Eng. Indic.	Anticipatory Indirect Question	qui etc.	1	1		3	2	7
	Past-future Relative Determinative and Generalizing Clauses	quicumque	3				1	1
	Past-future Temporal Clauses	ubi	1	4	2	1	3	11
	Past-future Conditions	cum	9	9	3	13	14	48
<i>may, might</i>	<b>Optative</b>					<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
	Substantive Clause of Entreaty. (Perhaps here belong some Clauses of Request given above.)	ut				1		1
<i>should</i>	<b>Obligation or Propriety</b>		<b>3</b>			<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>
	Indirect Questions of Propriety	{ quid cur qua re					1 2	1 3
	Relative Clauses of Propriety		3			1		4
<i>can, could</i>	<b>Potential</b>		<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>6</b>
	Relative Clauses of Possibility	qui etc.	2		2	2		6
<i>If he were, had been</i>	<b>Conditions Contrary to Fact</b>		<b>2</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
		si	2				2	4
These Clauses all express "Facts" and are almost without exception best translated by the English Indicative.	<b>Consecutive Clauses of Fact</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>313</b>
	Substantive Clauses of Fact	ut	6	6	9	10	12	43
Note that in direct and independent form, these ideas are expressed by the Indicative in Latin also.	After Negative expressions of Doubt	quin	3				1	4
	Clauses of Result	ut	9	13	15	9	8	54
	Relative Descriptive (Characteristic) Clauses	qui etc.	4	8	3	8	7	30
	Relative Causal	qui etc.				1	2	3
	Relative Adversative (Concessive)	qui etc.					1	1
	Cum-Descriptive (Circumstantial)	cum,—when	24	26	33	34	15	132
	Cum-Causal	cum—since	2	17	8	8	4	39
	Cum-Adversative (Concessive)	cum—although	2	1	2	1	1	7
These Clauses all express "Facts" and are almost without exception best translated by the English Indicative.	<b>Clauses of Fact in Indirect Discourse</b>		<b>64</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>299</b>
	Indirect Questions of Fact	Interrog. qui etc. quicumque	14 17	14 18	7 8	16 12	20 45	71 100
Note that in direct and independent form, these ideas are expressed by the Indicative in Latin also.	Relative Determinative, Forward-moving, Parenthetical and Generalizing Clauses in Indirect Discourse.	quam diu ubi unde	1		2 1	1	1	2 2 2
	Temporal Clauses in Indirect Discourse	cum posteaquam priusquam ut—when			1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 2 2
	Clauses of Comparison in Indirect Discourse.	-quam ut—as atque				1 1 2	2 2 2	3 3 3
	Neutral (Fact) Conditions in Indirect Discourse	si	7	5	2	5	19	38
	Quod-Substantive Clauses in Indirect Discourse	quod	11				9	20
	Clause of Concession in Indirect Discourse	tametsi					1	1
	Quod- and Quoniam-Clauses of Reason in Indirect Discourse	quod	8	5		2	13	28
	Quod-Clauses of Quoted Reason	quoniam	3	1		3	4	5
	Clause of Rejected Reason	quod				1		1
	Quod-Clauses of Reason "by Confusion."	quam quo quod	3					3
These Clauses all express "Facts" and are almost without exception best translated by the English Indicative.	<b>Clauses of Fact in Subjunctive by Attraction</b>			<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>
	Attracted Relative Determinative Clauses	qui etc.		4	2	2	1	9
	Attracted Quod-Clauses of Reason	quod		2	1			3
	Attracted Neutral (Fact) Conditions	si			1	1	1	3
	Attracted Temporal Clauses	prius quam				1		1
<b>Grand Totals,</b>			<b>190</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>972</b>

The scheme for the uses of the subjunctive in Caesar therefore resolves itself into a classification of those dependent clauses which have their verbs in the subjunctive. Here, as in case constructions, the aim is to get the pupil to group related uses. The first great division made is between those subjunctives expressing the various *non-fact* modal ideas for which the English translation is a subjunctive, or equivalent verb phrase, or an infinitive, and those subjunctives expressing *fact* the English equivalent of which is the indicative. This fundamental division is indicated on the chart by the heavy line.

Within these groups, as indicated, clauses are classified according to form and specific use. As was pointed out in the discussion of case constructions, categories are set up not only to accord with well-defined distinctions within the Latin itself but whenever the English idiom differs materially from the Latin. A case in point is the subjunctive in the Clause of Purpose, which is clearly volitive in Latin, while the English mood for such a clause is potential, and such a subjunctive is commonly translated, if a finite form is used at all, by a verb phrase with the auxiliary "may" or "might." It is very unfortunate for the clear understanding of the subjunctive as a whole that so many first books begin their treatment of the mood with this irregularly translated Clause of Purpose, with the tragic result that many pupils come to regard this use as normal and ever after say or try to say "may" or "might" every time they encounter a subjunctive, even when a modicum of linguistic sense would compel the use of the proper auxiliary or still more often the plain English indicative.<sup>2</sup> A much more common and much more typical use

<sup>2</sup>The following beautiful specimen of the translator's art, taken from Clark's *Interlinear Caesar*, Book IV, chap. xi, is an illustration in point (the italics are mine): "When Caesar *might be distant* from the enemy not more than twelve thousands of paces, the ambassadors return to him, as it had been appointed: who having met him on the march, did pray greatly he would not advance farther. When they *might have obtained* not that, they did request that he would send before to those horsemen, who *might have preceded* the troop, and would prohibit them from battle: and that he would make power to themselves of sending ambassadors unto the Ubii: if the chiefs and senate of whom *might have made* faith to themselves by oath, they did show themselves about to use that condition which *might be brought* by Caesar; he *might give* the space of three days to

of the subjunctive than to express purpose and one which has an exact equivalent in English, is found in the substantive clause usually object or subject of a verb of volition, command, urging, or the like; for example: "I insist that he *come*" (English subjunctive); or, using the English auxiliaries "shall" or "should," "I insist (present) that he shall come," "I insisted (past) that he should come." There are 133 of these clauses in the first four books of Caesar as against 57 clauses expressing purpose, as is shown in the table.

#### THE "NON-FACT" SUBJUNCTIVES

Under the general head of "volitive" belong 240 of the 344 *non-fact* subjunctives. Subdivision within this group is justified, even necessitated, by the difference of idiom in the two languages, that is to say, by the problem of *translation*. This is especially true of the last three uses within this group.

Another important *non-fact* use of the subjunctive, and one that has not generally received the recognition due it, is that in clauses of anticipation or expectancy. In earlier English the subjunctive is common in this use. The regular auxiliary, as in most volitive uses, is "shall" or "should;" for example: "Remain until I (*shall*) return," "I urged that he *should* (volitive) remain until I *should* (anticipatory) return," or, "I expected to see him when I should return." Such forward-looking clauses after a past main verb, as in the last example, are here classed as "past future," and always have their verbs in the subjunctive in Latin. This use is especially common in "past-future" conditional clauses. That is to say, after a past main verb the distinction is lost between a future more vivid ("shall") condition and a future less vivid ("should") condition, the verb becoming in either instance an imperfect subjunctive. The English usage shows an exact parallel, the auxiliaries "shall" or "should" becoming, or remaining, "should" after a past main verb. This change in Latin is not therefore due to "Indirect Discourse" but is, in the writer's opinion, one of the leading causes of that usage in Latin.

those things to be accomplished. Caesar did think all these to tend to that same (point), that the delay of three days having been interposed, the cavalry of them who *might be absent* might return."

There are 70 examples of this "past-future" subjunctive in Caesar I-IV, all to be translated by "should," if one wishes to be exact. By a recognition of this usage the pupil's faith in the auxiliary "should" as a probable translation of a *non-fact* subjunctive is greatly increased, relying on which even the most stupid will "arrive" much more often than not.

Of the other *non-fact* subjunctives I need not speak in detail. The notes in the text are usually adequate, and their very rareness renders them easy for the pupil to remember. It is the common, every-where-met constructions that need to be impressed in teaching.

#### THE "FACT" SUBJUNCTIVE

Almost two-thirds of the subjunctives here being discussed (628 out of 972) express *fact*, and are, with scarcely an exception, best translated by the English indicative. In other words, if a Caesar pupil failed absolutely to recognize two-thirds of his subjunctives (the *right* two-thirds, however) and proceeded to translate them as indicatives, he would be quite as well off as far as his translation is concerned. The troublesome question is: Which two-thirds? To determine this a detailed subdivision of these fact clauses is necessary.

The Consecutive Clauses make up a well-defined group. Result clauses and the closely related substantive clauses are most typical. Here belong the relative descriptive clauses and the developed *cum*-clauses. At this point a glance at the statistics (often the result of very arbitrary decisions, it must be confessed) will show what is the best "guess" at the translation for the conjunction *cum*; or to speak more accurately, one may here see in many instances how the *cum*-clause, descriptive of a situation, may take on the added idea of cause or opposition, and it is only when one or the other of these ideas becomes pre-eminent that the translation "since" or "although" is better than "when." The same development is shown in the threefold classification (based entirely on differences in translation) of the relative descriptive (characteristic) clauses.

The use of the subjunctive in Clauses of Fact in Indirect Dis-

course need no special mention. Whatever theories may be held as to the origin of this usage, it is certainly true that in classical Latin this use of the subjunctive is a mere mechanical device for showing that the clause is a part of an indirect quotation, a sort of half quotation mark, as it were. I need not add that under this head should be classified only such clauses as would in direct form have their verbs in the indicative. Here belong, of course, only those "Indirect Questions" about facts. Indirect Questions of Volition or Propriety are classed as such. The general scheme for the subjunctive in this department thus furnishes as a sort of "by-product," a fairly complete list of those clauses which do regularly have their verbs in the indicative. These need not to have been given so much in detail, and the writer does not so give them in the single wall charts for each book, of which, as was said at the beginning, this table is a compilation.

In the last group are given clauses having their verbs in the subjunctive by "attraction," a quite definite phenomenon in Latin usage, the origin of which need not be here discussed. The practical thing for the pupil to do here, as well as in dealing with clauses in indirect discourse, when he finds a verb in the subjunctive which he knows *ought to be* in the indicative, is to "apologize" for it, so to speak, on the ground that it is "in indirect discourse" or "attracted" and then go ahead and translate it as if it *were* in the indicative.

The aim, in such a presentation as has here been discussed, is to secure and fix in the mind of the pupil a sound basis for classification, with suggestions for proper translation of the subjunctive in its varied, yet quite definite, uses. When on taking up the reading of Caesar the pupil meets for the first time what may seem to him an endless variety of subjunctives, he should be saved from complete mystification and the attendant temptation to regard the whole thing as a guessing contest first and last. Even worse is the error of mechanically translating all subjunctives alike, an error fostered by the stock translations of the subjunctive in the paradigms of some first books and grammars. Of the two errors, I say, the former is less dangerous. For inasmuch as the two languages have much in common

in their modal machinery, the pupil will succeed in an adequate translation of a given subjunctive in direct proportion to his feeling for correct English, especially if we count out the large number of fact subjunctives he may miss altogether! The difficulty, however, is that such a method leaves the pupil always a guesser, and English, as well as Latin grammar, greatly needs intelligent, systematic treatment, and in no field is this need more apparent than in the use of the much-neglected English subjunctive.